

REMARKS

Reconsideration and re-examination is respectfully requested. The Examiner is thanked for the careful consideration given the last response to the office action.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103Claims 1-3 and 7-9:

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al (U.S. 6,282,581) in view of Katsube (U.S. 6,341,127).

Moore:

Moore describes a communications framework operable to support remote method invocation in a distributed object environment. (Moore, Abstract). In particular, Moore describes Figure 5 (a flow diagram illustrating the data flow of a remote method invocation), at column 10, lines 15-53, in part as:

“... the remote method invocation involves two processes 101a and 101b. A client 301... seeks to invoke a method of an implementation object 309 – existing in the second process 101b.... In step 1, the client 301 initiates the remote procedure call by issuing the method “result=object.foo(a,b,c)” on the Stub object 303... In step 2, the Stub object 303 converts this call to a distributed apply() function of the RPC_Transport 305. An intervening step of using a Quality of Service (QoS) parameter to select which RPC_Transport 305 to use is discussed below In step 3, the RPC_Client 311 establishes a protocol specific binding to the RPC_Server 315 i.e., the protocol establishes a communication channel to the second process, e.g., opens a socket, acquires a shared memory segment, or initializes an RS-232 port...”

Moore further describes, at columns 10- column 11, that a CallInfo object is marshaled into the communication channel, and that the CallInfo object can be used to obtain QoS parameters. Thus Moore effectively teaches that an object including any QoS parameters is forwarded to the RPC_Server, using a CallInfo object.

The Examiner admits, at page 4 of the office action that “Moore does not explicitly teach the method of claim 1, wherein the flow information is communicated to a classifying router prior to establishment of connection using a side channel, different from the communication channel and incorporating this flow information into the differentiated services classification subsystem of the classifying router to enable proper classification of the remote method invocation...”

The Examiner goes on to state that :

“... Katsube teaches “when it is judged that it is permitted to process the received LSP set up request message ... the boundary router 1012 inquires the resource management unit 4010 as to whether it is possible to secure necessary network resources such as a label (and bandwidth if necessary) or not, so as to judge whether it is possible to accept this LSP set up request. When it is judged that it is possible to accept this LSP set up request, either a message indicating the acceptance of the LSP set up request (which contains an information on a label assigned to the requested stream, etc.) is returned to the boundary router 1021, or the similar LSP set up request message is transmitted from the control message processing unit 4006 to a next hop (downstream) router (such as a router 1015 in the exemplary case shown in Fig. 1) for the requested stream.”

The above portion of Katsube thus appears to describe the set up of a label switched path across a boundary, where a boundary node receives a label if a path can be established.

In particular, Applicants note that Katsube describes a system which receives the LSP set up request, then determines whether it has the resources to parse the request.

In contrast, the present invention performs the side channel communication *prior* to receipt of the remote method invocation. This allows the data base to be set up in advance of the actual receipt of the RMI, thereby saving the delay that is incurred by Katsube as it determines whether sufficient resources exist to support the request. It does not appear to Applicant that this advantage is realized by Katsube, Moore or the combination thereof.

Moore describes forwarding QoS in the communication channel with the RPC. Katsube conditionally establishes label switched paths only after reviewing resource loading. The combination of the two neither describes nor suggests the limitations of the claims.

Accordingly, for at least the reason that the combination of references fails to teach or describe several limitations of the claims, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn. Claims 2 and 4-6 depend upon claim 1, serve to add further patentable limitations to claim 1, but are allowable for at least the reasons put forth with regard to claim 1.

Claim 7 includes limitations similar to those described above which differentiate over the combination of Moore and Katsube. For example, claim 7 recites "...An apparatus for classifying a remote method invocation from a client system that initiates connections to a remote server object using a client and underlying remote method invocation transport code, the apparatus comprising ... a module configured to detect when a connection carrying high value data for the remote method invocation is to be created ... a module configured to use a custom socket factory to obtain flow information associated with the detected connection, and to generate a socket therefore, the socket having a socket number associated therewith ... a module configured to use a side channel to communicate flow information, including the socket number, associated with the detected connection to a classifying router *prior to receipt of the remote method invocation*; and a module configured to incorporate this flow information into a differentiated services classification subsystem of the classifying router *to enable proper classification of the remote invocation method when it is later received...*" Accordingly, for reasons similar to those put forth with regard to claim 1, claim 7 and its associated dependent claims 8 and 10-12 are patentable over the combination of references, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 4 and 10:

Claims 4 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore in view of Katsube in further view of Weiss.

The Examiner relies on Weiss as teaching a Java Servlet. Even acknowledging that Weiss mentions a Java Servlet, Applicants maintain their position that the combination of Moore and Katsube fail to disclose a side channel used as recited in the claimed invention. Weiss does not add any further teachings of such a side channel. Accordingly, dependent claims 4 and 10 are patentable for at least the same reasons as their independent claims.

Conclusion

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned, Applicants' Attorney at 978-264-6664 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

August 2, 2006
Date

/Lindsay G. McGuinness/
Lindsay G. McGuinness, Reg. No. 38,549
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-6664